11

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

1.3

14

15

16

ADELMAN MATZ, P.C.

17 Attorneys for Defendants Sixuvus, Ltd., et al. GARY P. ADELMAN

18

SARAH MICHAL MATZ

19 20 KAREN WILLIS, Intervenor (Appearing telephonically) doing business as

Harlem West Entertainment

21

22

23

24

25

190718cantC Conference (In open court)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: In the matter of Can't Stop v. Sixuvus.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Levy, Ms. Matz, and Mr. Adelman.

And Ms. Willis, can you hear me?

MS. WILLIS: Good morning.

THE COURT: Everyone can have a seat.

We have a number of things percolating. Ms. Willis has made an application to recover on the bond that Sixuvus posted. We'll set a schedule for formal briefing on that. motion to intervene was still out there.

Last time we were here on this case, the parties were going to try to settle, which obviously didn't happen because the new lawsuit is filed. And failing that, the parties were supposed to confer on a briefing schedule for the motion to intervene, which I don't think ever happened.

Separately, there is a letter motion, which originally was to dissolve the March 16 T.R.O., which is now, I quess, an application for me to enforce it in some fashion, either by issuing a new order or contempt. I'm not really clear. I'm going to let everybody brief everything, but I want to take up the last one first.

Ms. Willis, I'm sure, is right that I don't understand everything that the parties may understand about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

Conference

Facebook, and I certainly don't understand technically how it works, but I do know what I meant when I entered the order, and what I meant was that the Sixuvus had to stop going around acting as though they were still Village People, and it seems to me that they did that. They aren't running, as far as the public can see, anything relating to the Village People or the Village People website. Whether, in the bowels of Facebook, in some technical way involving zeros and ones, the Kings of Disco page, in a way invisible to the public, has some technical relationship to the old Village People page is not really my concern. My concern is what the public can see and whether the public can be confused, and I don't see how that is happening, or can be happening now. So, I don't see the need for any emergency relief, but I'm going to let everybody brief everything. I did raise a question about the six hats. the defendants, in their response, made the point that that's not covered by the T.R.O. I'm not saying it is. This, it seems to me -- whether that's kosher is going to turn on what rights the plaintiff has in the trade dress, and I'm sure I will be hearing from the parties on that as the case proceeds. When we were last here on this case, it looked like at least Can't Stop and the Sixuvus were getting to "yes," and it seemed like Ms. Willis was interested in discussing that,

SABRINA A. D'EMIDIO - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER (914)390-4053

lot went down the tubes because we had the previous -- the

and then obviously everything went down the tubes, or a least a

190718cantC Conference other lawsuit and the hearing on that in 19 CV 4354. 1 2 I gather there haven't been any three-way discussions 3 since then. 4 MR. ADELMAN: Not three way, but Mr. Levy and I have 5 had - and Mr. Besser - have had several conversations since the 6 previous lawsuit was withdrawn. That reactivated the interest 7 in Can't Stop and Sixuvus to settle this, and we're close. 8 MR. LEVY: We're close. 9 THE COURT: I know Mr. Levy doesn't like coming here, 10 but in some respects, he's the voice of reason in this. 11 MR. ADELMAN: Well, --12 THE COURT: I don't mean the other parties are 1.3 unreasonable. I just mean that he and his clients, I don't 14 want to say they're caught in the middle because the problem is 15 of their making, but they are in the middle, trying to maintain 16 good relationships with both groups. 17 And it seems, although I can't know what's going on 18 behind the scenes, it seems like Mr. Levy's clients are 19 communicating with Ms. Willis, even if Mr. Levy isn't. I would 20 just love to get everybody in a room. I don't know if that's practical given Ms. Willis is in California and Can't Stop is 21 2.2. in France and here we are in New York. 23 MR. ADELMAN: I mean, it's impractical for other

MR. ADELMAN: I mean, it's impractical for other reasons, which I'd rather not discuss on the record.

24

25

MR. LEVY: We are close. I sent a draft settlement

2.2.

Conference

agreement to -- pardon me for not getting up -THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. LEVY: I sent a draft agreement to Mr. Adelman on June 25th. His clients are overseas, and he has a lot of clients. I do speak to Mr. Adelman regularly. I think we're very close. He thinks he's close. But because of his clients being overseas, we had hoped to have this done before today, but it's taking longer.

As far as Ms. Willis is concerned, she speaks with my co-counsel, Robert Besser, and we sent over the draft agreement, the proposed draft. At least initially, it's just between Can't Stop and Sixuvus, but Mr. Besser showed her the prior draft that I agreed to make, gave me her comments. We incorporated her comments into the draft that I eventually sent on June 25th.

So, we think we're pretty close. We're trying to do it one at a time. We felt we would try to settle with Sixuvus and then we would go to Ms. Willis, because I think in one of the documents that Ms. Willis submitted in one of these cases, she said we agree with this; that, right now, the issue that she's raising is not so much trademark infringement but confusion by the public. And that's always our concern, as well.

At this stage -- there's a doctrine in the Second Circuit, and I think in every circuit, a doctrine called

Conference

progressive encroachment, which, basically, it does not require us as a licensor to go after every perceived infringement or problem of a junior trademark user. And right now, we don't see that much happening. And to the extent that things come up, we're taking that into account, that mechanism, we're taking that into account in the settlement proposal that was made.

And without giving all the terms, I think I did
mention to the Court previously that a key component is for the
Court to have continuing jurisdiction over any disputes that
would come up, and that would give everybody a forum without
litigation, like a two-page letter, saying the hats are a
problem, if we couldn't work it out, and put two pages in,
there's a ruling, and that's it.

THE COURT: So I get to live with you guys for as long as I live. Awesome.

MR. LEVY: We like you so much.

THE COURT: Or Judge Smith.

MR. ADELMAN: Actually, to Mr. Levy's point, we're actually not litigating this case. What is happening is,
Ms. Willis finds something to nitpick on, she sends you a letter, we respond, and now we're briefing three different motions. We're not actually litigating. And we don't want to litigate. We can come to terms. Can't Stop is the trademark owner. They don't have a problem with what my clients are

Conference

1 doing.

2.2.

THE COURT: Well, one of the things that we're going to litigate is whether Ms. Willis can intervene and on what basis.

MR. ADELMAN: Shouldn't that be the only thing we're focusing on at this point?

MS. WILLIS: I want to make sure I clarify something that he just stated on the record. Mr. Levy just stated on the record, and this is for clarification, that Can't Stop does not have a problem with what they're doing?

MR. LEVY: As far as we know, the only thing that's been brought to our attention was that they were performing — the Sixuvus group was performing in Holland at a festival where they were dressed in tuxedos, made no reference that we could see to Village People, and that the only reference that was brought to our attention was a newspaper article in Dutch saying that the Village People might be a surprise guest, and it was from a newspaper clipping. It didn't come from the Sixuvus group.

So, again, I know Ms. Willis was very riled up by that, but, again, following the doctrine of progressive encroachment, I don't think Can't Stop is obligated to sue on that. We don't think it rises to that level. We do want to protect the mark, and if we found there were problems — I did mention to Mr. Adelman, we did not like the use of the hats,

Conference

but that's something that, when we're talking settlement, I 1 2 think it gets worked out. That's all. 3 THE COURT: Well, look, I think in terms of what 4 order we should do things in --5 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, I want to make sure the 6 record is clear here, and I want to make sure the record is 7 clear with respect to what Mr. Levy is putting on the record in 8 agreement possibly with Mr. Adelman, okay, so I want to make 9 sure that this is clear here. 10 So, Sixuvus has gone around, really for guite a few 11 months now, dressing as the Village People in their 12 performances, and in some of the cases, they've done that 13 subtly. And they have basically done Village People complete 14 sets, for example, and there's a performing as if they're 15 Village People, okay, they really are, with the exception of 16 them coming on in some, what you call them, jogging suits and 17 then they pull them off, and then they become Village People. 18 Am I to understand, Mr. Levy, you're saying on the 19 record that you don't have a problem with that on behalf of 20 Can't Stop? 21 THE COURT: He didn't say that. I didn't hear him 22 say that. 23 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, --24 THE COURT: Hold on, Ms. Willis. Let me just finish 25 my sentence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

Conference

What I heard him say was that, what he understands to be going on currently, is the tuxedo show that some newspaper article, which is in Dutch, which I don't read, included the words Village People, and he and his clients don't think it's worth suing over that article. I didn't hear him say anything about it being okay for Sixuvus to do full shows as Village People. And I assume this settlement that is percolating is going to include some parameters --MR. LEVY: That's right. MR. ADELMAN: Yes. THE COURT: -- about the extent to which the Sixuvus can, in a tribute format or otherwise, include some Village People performance within their larger performance. Look, the record, anybody can order it. It says what it says. MS. WILLIS: Okay. THE COURT: I did not hear anything suggesting that Can't Stop thinks it's fine for Sixuvus to perform as Village People. MS. WILLIS: Well, Mr. Adelman made the broad statement that Can't Stop does not have a problem with what they're doing, that's why, your Honor. That's what he said. THE COURT: Well, that was a present-tense statement. MS. WILLIS: No, no, no, your Honor, no. He made it

2.2.

23

24

25

Conference

10

broad -- you did not ask him specifically, just deal with this 1 2 issue. He meant in general. 3 Now, and I'm simply trying to clarify here, all I'm 4 saying is, for example, I have never, with Mr. Besser nor 5 Jonathan, we've never discussed Can't Stop litigating the issue 6 of them with respect to them performing this maestro wear, 7 never once did that come up. I don't know where the term 8 mediation comes up. However, we did actually discuss some 9 concerns over that, okay, of that article purporting that the 10 Village People were actually performing with the maestro when the Village People were not. That's the extent of it, your 11 12 Honor. 13 MR. ADELMAN: That's not the extent, your Honor. 14 MS. WILLIS: Well, --15 MR. ADELMAN: First of all -- excuse me, Ms. Willis, 16 I'm speaking. 17 The article was days before the festival and it 18 conjectured that the Village People might be a surprise quest. 19 It was some reporter making conjecture. Nothing -- there was 20 no promotion, no marketing. The contract -- nothing suggested 21

no promotion, no marketing. The contract -- nothing suggested that the Village People were performing at all. André Rieu, who is very well respected and probably a hero in the Netherlands, made it very clear. My clients made it very clear on our Facebook page that everybody should reference any videos taken of the show as Kings of Disco, very clear on our Facebook

190718cantC Conference

1 page.

2.2.

What Ms. Willis did was she posted on their Facebook page, calling André Rieu a fraud and saying all kinds of disparaging things about him, calling him and saying -- I'm not sure exactly what she said, because, again, I'm speaking to a Dutch lawyer, but it sounded like what she was saying is that she was going to sue them. So frankly --

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, --

MR. ADELMAN: Excuse me, ma'am. I am still speaking.

THE COURT: Ms. Willis, hold on.

MS. WILLIS: Well, finish up.

MR. ADELMAN: What I meant by Can't Stop -- I'll finish when I'm ready. Jesus.

THE COURT: Take a deep breath, Mr. Adelman.

MR. ADELMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

What I meant was two-fold: one is, is that actually Mr. Levy and I discussed it, and I think Mr. Levy is saying exactly what Can't Stop means, is there was no cause for a lawsuit, so why should they bring one. And I agree. And what I meant by saying that we have done nothing wrong, is not only present tense, but I am sure if what Ms. Willis is saying about my clients and what they're doing was true, she would have already brought it to the attention of this Court half a dozen times, but my clients have been working with Can't Stop to find a suitable way for them to move forward as Kings of Disco.

12 190718cantC Conference 1 THE COURT: Look, we don't need to --2 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, --3 THE COURT: The whole thing in the Netherlands is a 4 side show, --5 MR. ADELMAN: Yes. 6 THE COURT: -- at least as far as I'm concerned. 7 I understand that one or more of the parties may be 8 worked up about it, but what I do is try to manage a lawsuit. 9 And right now, we have a lawsuit in which Can't Stop is suing 10 Sixuvus, and Ms. Willis has provisionally intervened. If I remember, and you guys will correct me if I'm 11 12 wrong, she has made a motion to intervene and we have to 13 schedule the other parties' responses. 14 Am I right about that? 15 MS. MATZ: Yes, your Honor, although -- may I raise 16 one issue. THE COURT: Yes. 17 18 MS. MATZ: If your Honor will indulge me. 19 THE COURT: As long as it doesn't have to do with the 20 Netherlands. 21 MS. MATZ: No. It has nothing to do with the 2.2. Netherlands. I promise. 23 I do think one of the issues -- I just want to bring 24 up that Ms. Willis did say in one of her letters that she

> SABRINA A. D'EMIDIO - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER (914)390-4053

intends to somehow amend her pleading. I know that one of the

25

2.2.

issues with respect to whether or not someone is allowed to intervene rests on the types of claims they are asserting.

So, only in terms of efficiency, frankly, for my clients and the Court, I think that to the extent Ms. Willis plans on amending her pleading and the Court is going to entertain that application, it would be helpful for that to happen prior to the time that the intervenor motion is briefed, only because if we brief the intervenor motion and then she amends and we have to rebrief it because the change has some impact on it, I think that that would probably not be the most efficient use of anyone's resources.

THE COURT: That's not a bad point.

Is it your desire to amend, Ms. Willis?

MS. WILLIS: Yes, it is, your Honor, but however, I must return here back to the Netherlands here. I can't allow Mr. Adelman to do his hit-and-run statement here without me responding on the record.

What actually happened, your Honor, what actually happened in the Netherlands, is that they did all the things that Mr. Adelman states, and André Rieu, by the way, after they fact, after they were called upon it. The truth of the matter is the newspaper reported it, and I have a print of the article that André Rieu was actually suggesting that the Village People were performing with him. It wasn't until later, when I actually complained, that they clarified it, much later.

1.3

2.2.

Conference

And also, your Honor, he's stating that there was no promotion. There was, in fact, promotion. We have a video with André Rieu promoting the fact that Village People were performing with him. So the truth of the matter is, before I actually complained, it was being widely reported that Village People were performing with André Rieu.

THE COURT: You've put that on the record. That's

THE COURT: You've put that on the record. That's fine. André, whoever he is, is not a party here. I'm not worried about him. I'm worried about the parties that are in front of me. We have a bunch of --

MS. WILLIS: I wish you would tell Mr. Adelman's (inaudible) statement on the record. I'm simply trying to clarify here.

THE COURT: I've let you clarify. All I'm saying is, because this gentleman is not a party -- now both sides have put something on the record about what happened in the Netherlands that really doesn't have anything to do with me. So, let's now turn to what is percolating here.

We have the application to amend, the application to intervene, the motion to enforce the T.R.O., the motion to collect on the bond. I do think probably neither Ms. Willis nor the Sixuvus want to brief them all at the same time, and I don't think it would make sense to brief them all at the same time.

If you want to amend, Ms. Willis, I think it does SABRINA A. D'EMIDIO - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

(914)390-4053

Conference

make sense to do that before we get to the other things. What would you like to -- give me the "Reader's Digest" version of what amendments you'd like to make.

MS. WILLIS: I think, your Honor, you -- in a prior conference, you had indicated that you were leaning against allowing other parties to be named, for example, and so stuff like that would be, you know, meted out, the other parties, and it would basically mirror Can't Stop's claim with respect -- with the exception of a couple of things.

MS. MATZ: If I may, typically when a party requests leave to amend, a proposed amended pleading is provided. And just so that this isn't as much of a moving target, I think it would be helpful if maybe Ms. Willis provided the proposed amendment, and then -- I don't think there needs to be a full briefing on it, but maybe we can just submit letters with any issues, and your Honor can rule and proceed.

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, I actually did state that already. I already -- if you look at my communication, it states the proposed amendment in there. It did. And it states exactly what I said. It even talked about removing (inaudible), so it's been done.

THE COURT: I do remember reading that that was your intention.

Did you actually submit the proposed amended complaint?

ı	Case 7:17-cv-06513-CS
	190718cantC Conference
1	MS. MATZ: No, your Honor.
2	MS. WILLIS: I didn't. I can certainly submit the
3	proposed complaint. That's not a problem here.
4	THE COURT: All right. So let's do this. How long
5	would you need to do that?
6	MS. WILLIS: What is this I probably can do that
7	within the next 30 days, 20, 30 days, I can probably do that.
8	THE COURT: All right. Today is July 18. August 18
9	is a Sunday. So, Monday August 19th, Ms. Willis will submit a
10	proposed amended complaint.
11	And a letter from the defendants stating their
12	position, how long would you want for that?
13	MS. MATZ: Just the last two weeks of August are a
14	little
15	THE COURT: Vacation time?
16	MS. MATZ: Can we have until the 9th of September?
17	Would that be acceptable to the Court?
18	THE COURT: Yes. And then you'll say either say,
19	okay, fine, we don't object or here's why you shouldn't allow
20	amendment. If there's going to be opposition, then I'll allow
21	Ms. Willis to respond. Once I rule on that, then opposition to

MS. MATZ: Yes, your Honor, I would agree.

the motion to intervene seems like the next logical step.

23

24

25

THE COURT: So, why don't we say that will be 30 days after I rule on the amended complaint --

190718cantC Conference

1.3

1 MS. MATZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- or you tell me that there's no opposition.

MS. MATZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And then Ms. Willis, assuming you get opposition to the motion to intervene, how long would you like for your reply?

MS. WILLIS: About 20 days.

THE COURT: Okay, 20 days thereafter.

Once I rule on that, I'll schedule briefing on the motion to collect on the bond. And some day, maybe we'll even get to discovery.

MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, the motion to collect on bond cannot be withheld pending all of this. That's something that is already filed and it's supposed to be priority. It is not contingent on other things here, it's not at all. And so I object, your Honor, on the record here, if your Honor is stating that she's not prepared to move forward immediately on the briefing on that, because it's just not something that can be trailed. I have a right to seek that immediately.

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Matz, it does seem like even if I don't allow the intervention, that motion is still going to be out there because the T.R.O. did enjoin Ms. Willis.

Ms. Willis, I think, is correct that the motion to collect on

190718cantC Conference

the bond isn't really contingent on the motion to amend or the motion to intervene, so why can't we have briefing on that on the same schedule --

MS. MATZ: Well, so --

THE COURT: -- as the motion to intervene?

MS. MATZ: First of all, are you taking the papers that she submitted previously as her moving papers on the bond? I was a little unclear about that.

THE COURT: I thought they were intended as such, but let me ask Ms. Willis.

Did you plan to make a more formal motion or was that your motion?

MS. WILLIS: No, that's the motion. All the points are there.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. WILLIS: They have the right to oppose it and of course, I can reply. And we're already on calendar on it, then I need to have it moved immediately. I don't want to wait.

THE COURT: I'm addressing your concern. I just said to Ms. Matz that I think you're right, that that motion is not contingent on the other motions.

If you want, Ms. Matz, I'll consider your letter as your opposition if you don't want to do anything more formal, either. And then it would just be Ms. Willis' reply, and then I can rule.

Conference

I'm sorry. No, I think, your Honor, we 1 2 would want to do something a little bit more formal. 3 THE COURT: All right. I think Ms. Willis has a 4 We don't need to wait until the fall for that. 5 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, I believe the Court should 6 use discretion. If you take a look at -- it was a letter 7 motion, Ms. Matz, the Sixuvus, they have opposed it. They 8 opposed it, your Honor, in a letter opposition. In there, they 9 made points, okay, so it's being briefed. The only thing 10 that's missing, your Honor, is my reply to that. Instead, they want to go and review this. And I think your Honor has enough 11 12 before her. Your Honor has my actual brief, moving papers. 1.3 They have opposed it. 14 Now, your Honor, they could have chosen not to oppose 15 it in their letter. They did. Look at the points they made. 16 It's there. 17 THE COURT: Ms. Willis, you need to take a breath, 18 also. 19 I said that opposition to the motions was not 20 required. I asked for the equivalent of a pre-motion letter. 21 I am not going to preclude formal opposition. I'm going to let 22 them formally oppose. 23 MS. WILLIS: Okay. 24 THE COURT: So, how long, Ms. Matz, would you like 25 for your opposition to the bond motion?

2.2.

Conference

MS. MATZ: Well, your Honor, I'm sorry. I just want to backtrack a moment. You asked me a question and I said one other thing and then we got a little sidetracked. And you asked me whether or not I did think it was impacted by the motion to intervene, and I'm just going to be frank with your Honor. I believe it could be, because you do need to remember also that the bond was posted with respect to the first T.R.O. that was when Ms. Willis was not a party to the case at all.

And I also think that because some of the things she has submitted as fees, and I think the law is pretty clear that she's not going to get it anyways, but to the extent your Honor might disagree with me, some of the things she has submitted as fees relate to her application to intervene, they relate to her pleadings and other things. And to the extent that she's not an intervenor, those things could be affected by those arguments.

MS. WILLIS: No.

THE COURT: I don't think that's so, because, really, the only fees that she would be entitled to collect from the bond would be those occasioned by the injunction, and that's a much narrower set of expenses than everything to do with this lawsuit.

So, I think whether or not I ultimately allow permanent intervention and whether it's as of right or discretionary, I still think the issue of whether the

24

25

Conference

injunction resulted in any harm to Ms. Willis, that she can 1 2 collect on from the bond, is right. 3 You can put in your opposition why you think that's 4 not correct. 5 MS. MATZ: That's fair enough. 6 THE COURT: I think you are correct in your papers 7 when you say that you can only collect from the bond that which 8 was occasioned by the injunction, not that which was occasioned 9 by the lawsuit writ large. 10 MS. MATZ: Okay. 11 MS. WILLIS: And I state that. In my brief, I 12 clearly outline that these fees are all relevant. I'm not 1.3 attempting to collect anything broad. If they want to discuss 14 that, that's a part of their opposition. It's there. 15 And your Honor, also from the date -- we have to be 16 careful here because there are some statutory times running, 17 time limits here from the time that I actually filed that 18 letter motion for them to respond here on it, so the Court 19 should be concerned, should be wary of that. 20 THE COURT: I'm sorry. What statutory time limit are 21 you referring to? 2.2. MS. WILLIS: Well, for example, when you file a 23 motion, right, there's a motion that's filed before the Court,

THE COURT: Well, in the absence of an order to the

SABRINA A. D'EMIDIO - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER (914)390-4053

there's a certain amount of time allotted for the opposition.

```
190718cantC
                      Conference
     contrary, the local rule governs, but I'm about to enter an
 1
 2
     order to the contrary, but I would like to see it before you go
 3
     on vacation, Ms. Matz.
 4
               So, when can you file your opposition to the bond
 5
    motion?
 6
               MS. MATZ: Can we have until the 19th of August?
 7
     That's about 30 days.
 8
               THE COURT: And then how long for your reply,
    Ms. Willis?
 9
10
               MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, I think 30 days is too long.
11
     I oppose that.
12
               MS. MATZ: Your Honor, --
13
               THE COURT: It's within my discretion. I'm going to
14
     allow it.
15
               MS. WILLIS: Okay.
16
               THE COURT: We're all very busy. I don't know that I
17
     would even, if it were filed sooner, that I would get to it any
18
     sooner.
19
              How long would you like after August 19 for your
20
    reply?
21
              MS. WILLIS: I have to look at my schedule here.
    About 20 days later.
22
23
               THE COURT: Let's see. September 9th is 21 days
24
     later.
25
              MS. WILLIS: Okay.
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Conference

THE COURT: So, the proposed amended complaint is going to be filed August 19. September 9, the defendants are either going to say they don't object or they're going to submit a letter brief opposing. If they do that September 9th, and this is one date I haven't set, how long after that date would you like to respond to their opposition of September 9th? MS. WILLIS: Well -- no, I had to reply on September 9th. THE COURT: You're filing the proposed amended complaint on August 19th. On September 9th, they're either going to say fine or we oppose for these reasons. And then you're entitled to reply to that. MS. WILLIS: Right. THE COURT: How long after September 9th --MS. WILLIS: That's generally about 20 days after that. THE COURT: All right. So, that would be September 30th. The 29th is the Saturday. And the 30th -- no, the 29th is a Sunday, so September 30th. And once I rule on that, we've set 30 days for the opposition to the motion to intervene, and the reply 20 days thereafter. In the meantime, the opposition to the bond motion is

SABRINA A. D'EMIDIO - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER (914)390-4053

going to be filed August 19th and the reply will be September

Conference

1 9th.

1.3

2.2.

And once the motion to intervene is decided, if I grant it, then we will move forward with discovery, but we'll need to know who the parties are before we can do that.

In the meantime, I feel like a broken record, but it seems crazy that, if there's an agreement floating out there that Can't Stop has proposed which takes into account the concerns that Ms. Willis expressed to Can't Stop, it seems just nuts to me that we can't resolve the whole case.

And I think if Ms. Willis wanted to be a full-time lawyer, she would have done that with her degree. I can't imagine she wants to spend her time briefing motions. I can't imagine Sixuvus and Can't Stop want to keep paying their lawyers.

I really hope that this agreement, which sounds like we're closing in on between Can't Stop and Sixuvus, is something that Ms. Willis will give serious thought to signing onto or signing onto a separate agreement that protects her rights but acknowledges that her rights are limited to her agreement with Can't Stop, and that there are going to be mechanisms in place if Sixuvus or Kings of Disco pushes their luck.

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, you're absolutely correct.

If this is the same reason that was represented to me from

Can't Stop from Mr. Belolo, as well as Bob Besser, if this is

2.2.

Conference

the same, I have already given my blessings to it. It's my understanding it's the Sixuvus who is sort of dragging their feet here. So, yes, there is something that is before them now that I don't have a problem with.

THE COURT: That would be lovely. And I know all the

performers are travelers, and it's not always easy to get everybody in the same room, but I suspect that Ms. Matz and Mr. Adelman are doing everything they can to wrestle that particular bear to the ground. And I'm sure the Sixuvus themselves would rather not to have keep paying lawyers if they can help it.

So, I'm sure there will be progress made. And if it can be made in the next four weeks, then all these papers that I've just described don't have to be filed, and that would be a lovely thing for all of you and for me.

Anything else we should do today?

MS. WILLIS: Yes.

MS. MATZ: May I ask one clarification question.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. MATZ: And that is, with respect to Ms. Willis' letters for clarification of the March 16, 2019, T.R.O., your Honor expressed what you intended orally earlier at this conference. Are we to take that as the order on the clarification? I don't really believe any further briefing is necessary on this issue.

1.3

2.2.

Conference

THE COURT: Agreed. The point is, and I think everybody agrees, that as far as what the public can see, the Sixuvus are not representing themselves to be Village People, and I am unconcerned if, as I said, as a matter of computer science, the page that's now Kings of Disco is what used to be the official Village People.

Now the disposition of the "likes" I think I've

Now, the disposition of the "likes," I think I've said before, this is a new area, and maybe there will be case law that convinces me otherwise or maybe there will be argument that convinces me otherwise when we get to summary judgment, but it seems to me that when somebody "liked" the Village People page in 2016, they were not "liking" the name Village People; they were "liking" the group.

So, if those "likes" follow the performers --

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, --

THE COURT: Ms. Willis, I am talking.

MS. WILLIS: Okay.

THE COURT: If those "likes" follow the performers to a page that now says Kings of Disco, that doesn't seem wrong to me. However, as I said, there may be case law that I'm not aware of or there may be arguments that haven't yet been made that would convince me otherwise at the appropriate time. But right now, it seems to me the people who clicked "like" were not saying, oh, I like the words "village" and "people" next to each other; they were saying I like these particular

2.2.

Conference

performers. Just like if somebody "likes" Mr. Willis, and whenever the license expires, Can't Stop gives it to a third party, I don't think that third party would be allowed to represent that the people who "liked" Mr. Willis really liked it. So, I hope that's enough clarification.

I'm not going to require any further machinations within Facebook. I don't see any chance that the confusion that was the reason for the order persists. And it seems to me the order allowed for the disabling of the account in any number of ways, one of which was specified, but not mandated. So, I don't think anything further is needed on that.

MS. MATZ: So we can --

MS. WILLIS: May I now, your Honor. First, I want to say, your Honor, I object to each and every aspect of the statement that you put on the record. Each and every aspect, I object to it.

I want to remind the Court that the only way that what your Honor stated could be, I guess, a fact, would be that if, in fact, the Facebook page was that of the Sixuvus, and then the Court can actually argue that, you know what? They like the Sixuvus. Who are the Sixuvus? Oh, they're those individual people that's a part of that corporation.

Your Honor here is putting on the record that when the public "liked" Village People, they "liked" the actual individual members who were performing as Village People, and I

1.3

Conference

object to that. Just for the record, I don't think that is correct. I believe that's error, but your Honor, I don't have to argue any further on it, but I put on the record that I object to each and every aspect of your Honor's assessment of this.

THE COURT: When we get to discovery, maybe you'll be able to gather evidence that will convince me I'm wrong, but right now, that's my impression.

Also, I think, even if you were correct, I think the party that would be entitled to direct the disposition of those "likes" would be Can't Stop, but in any event, when we get to discovery, anybody can take depositions of the people who "liked" Village People back in 2016 and earlier. And if they say, Oh, what I liked was the words "village" and "people" next to each other as opposed to the performance of the people who were performing as Village People, maybe there will be something different. Or if they say, No, it didn't have anything to do with the people, it was just the notion of these six characters — we'll see. I'm not ruling anything out. All I'm saying is, for now, I don't see any need for further papers on that.

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, --

THE COURT: I understand you object, but that's --

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, I want to make one other point of clarification here for the Court.

23

24

25

Conference

29

Your Honor, that would be like saying that if you 1 2 have a certified page for the Lion King, that they actually --3 when the people "liked" the Lion King page, they could happen 4 like the particular performers that are in the Lion King at 5 that time. It does not make sense, your Honor. I believe your 6 Honor is not correct. I object, but thank you for putting it 7 on the record, your Honor. I'm done with that part of it. I 8 don't want to argue anymore. 9 THE COURT: All right. And I will hope that this 10 will all go away for numerous reasons, but if it doesn't, I 11 will look for the various submissions on the dates we have set. 12 Thank you, all. 1.3 MS. MATZ: Thank you, your Honor. MS. WILLIS: Thank you. 14 15 16 Certified to be a true and correct 17 transcript of the stenographic record 18 to the best of my ability. Jabrina A. Vemidio 19 U.S. District Court 20 Official Court Reporter 21 22